DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 891.9111/279 FOR #634

FROM Persia (Hart) DATED May 20, 1931

TO NAME

1—1172 G P O

REGARDING:

Presentation of a bill to the Persian Medjliss requesting ratification of a Perso-Greek Treaty of Friendship.

767.9111/16

Wi

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 791.00/10 FOR #981

FROM Persia (Hart) DATED Dec. 16, 1931

TO NAME 1—1127

REGARDING: Treaty of Friendship and Security between Turkey and Persia. Two copies in Persian, French and Turkish of the ,-, dated April 22, 1926.

Two copies in Persian of the Proces-verbal of signing the Treaty of Friendship and Security.

Protocol annexed to Treaty of Friendship and Security. Two copies in Persian, Turkish and French of ,-, dated June 15, 1928.

las

767.9111/17

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 867.9111/366 FOR Report #-

FROM Istanbul (Allen) DATED June 17,1932
TO NAME

1—1127 ore

REGARDING: Turkish-Persian Treaty of Friendship.
Ankara report that on June 11 the Assembly ratified a treaty of "entente".

767.9111/18

leb

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 891.9111/306 FOR #1174

FROM Persia (Hart) DATED June 30, 1932

TO NAME

1—1127 ...

REGARDING: The National Assembly ratified the Turko-Persian Treaty of Friendship, Judicial Settlement and Abritration. The IRAN on June 20 advises that the -.

las

767.9111/19

767.9111

767.9111
767.9112
767.9115

2) Perso-Turkish Treaties of January 23, 1932.

a) Ratification by Turkish National Assembly.

The IRAN on June 20 carried the following message from the AGENCE ANATOLIE: "Ankara, June 18. The National Assembly ratified the Turko-Persian Treaty of Friendship, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration, as well as the Frontier Agreement. Tewfik Rusty Bey's explanatory

remarks

remarks as to the fraternal sentiments existing between the two countries were received with acclamation."

b) Persian Majlis Ratified Arbitration Treaty.

The same paper reported the ratification by the Majlis "on final reading" of the first of the above mentioned treaties, recalling at the same time that the frontier agreement had been similarly ratified on May 26, last.

Comment: The text of the Frontier Agreement was submitted with despatch No. 1156 of June 11, 1932. The text of the arbitration treaty is not yet released for publication, but it is said to follow the usual form of such treaties. The local press is still unanimous in its favorable comment on both treaties--e.g., the IRAN on June 21 said, in part: "We must all be profoundly grateful that the two great and modern Chiefs of the Turkish and Persian States have made possible this true rapprochement of their two peoples. There exists today, for the first time in hundreds of years, no divergence of views between them."

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

767.91/11-20

SEE 767.91/11 FOR 1937

FROM Turkey (Churchill) DATED Nov. 7, 1938

TO NAME

1-1127 OFO

REGARDING:

Treaties between Persia and Turkey concerning friendship, neutrality, political and economic cooperation and a previous agreement concerning extradition.

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

767.91111/21

SEE 767.91/73 FOR Despatch # 1304.

FROM Persia (Hart) DATED December 15, 1932.
TO NAME

1—1127 GPO

REGARDING: Treaty of security and friendship signed at Ankara on November 5, 1932, between Turkey and Persia.

hs

Teheran, December 15, 1932.

No. 1304.

Subject: Transmitting Official Texts of New Turko-Persian Treaties of Security and Friendship.

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to my despatch No. 1278 of November 12, 1932, discussing briefly post-war Turko-Persian treaty relations and reporting the signature at Ankara on November 5, last, of two new treaties--one of security and one of friendship--between the two countries.

Copies of the French language texts of the two new treaties, as officially communicated to and published in
1/ the local press of today's date, are enclosed. They were presented yesterday to the Persian Majlis by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The latter, it will be recalled, had personally signed the new treaties when in Ankara on his return journey from attending

attending the September General Assembly of the League of Nations. There follows an account of the Minister's remarks when presenting them to the Majlis for ratification:

> His Highness spoke with eloquent eulogy of Perso-Turkish friendship, recalling in enthusiastic terms the exceptionally warm welcome received during his recent visit to Ankara from His Excellency the Ghazi, the Ministers, the President of the Chamber, the journalists and the entire Turkish people. He concluded by declaring that he did not believe that there existed elsewhere in the world two peoples so closely and sincerely united as those of Persia and Turkey.

The new Treaty of Friendship is short, consisting of but four articles, and follows--except for omission of the conventional arbitration clause, which since between the two countries is covered by the special treaty of January 23, 1931--the lines of Persia's so-called post-capitulatory treaties of friendship. Its object is declared to be: "To reestablish, in a new Treaty of Friendship, the dispositions of the articles of their Treaty of Friendship and Security of April 22, 1926, concerning the general relations of the two countries." Its four articles may be recapitulated as follows:

> Article 1 provides for inviolable peace and sincere and perpetual friendship.
>
> Article 2 accords reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment to diplomatic and consular representatives in accord with the principles of international law.
>
> Article 3 envisages the regulation, in accord with the same principles, of "consular commercial, customs and navigation relations as well as conditions of residence and sojourn."
>
> Article 4 provides for entry into force upon exchange of ratifications at Teheran and makes no provision for cancellation or expiration.

The

The new Treaty of Security, consisting of eight articles, is a shortened and amended version of the above-mentioned treaty of April 22, 1926. Such of the earlier treaty's articles as are applicable are repeated verbatim. Thus articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9 of the 1926 treaty become Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 8 of the new. The remaining two articles of the new treaty--Articles 4 and 6--are taken verbatim from the Protocol (of June 15, 1928) to the original 1926 treaty.

The effect of the sum total of the whole I venture to describe as the reconfirmation of a status of benevolent neutrality as between the two states.

Respectfully yours,

Charles C. Hart.

Enclosure:

1. Text of two new treaties between Turkey and Persia.

Copy to E.I.C., Paris.

File No. 710.

GW/PE

1004 of December 15, 1932, from the Legation at Teheran.

No 1808 Vendredi 16 Décembre 1932 — 25 Azar Mâh 1311 — HUITIÈME ANNÉE

ADMINISTRATION:
TEHERAN
Rue Arbab Kei-Khosrow
No 6 (Kiabane Nadiri)
TELEPHONE No. 576
Adresse Télégraphique:
"Le Messager - Téhéran"
Directeur—Propriétaire:
François Mclek-Karam

Le Messager de Téhéran

(publie les dépêches de toutes les sources en déclinant toute responsabilité quant a leur teneur)
Seul journal en Perse publiant le même jour, en français et en anglais les nouvelles du monde entier.
Paraissant tous les jours, excepté le mardi et samedi.

Pour abonnements et annonces, écrire ou s'adresser directement à la Rédaction, de 1 à 9 heures du soir.

Organe d'informations politiques et commerciales de la plus stricte impartialité.

Texte officiel communiqué par le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères.

TRAITÉ
ENTRE
L'EMPIRE PERSAN et la RÉPUBLIQUE TURQUE

Animés du désir de resserrer les liens de sincère amitié si heureusement existant entre Eux.

Et considérant la nécessité de déterminer les conditions concrètes de leurs rapports politiques et économiques,

Ont résolu de renouveler leur Traité d'Amitié et de Sécurité du 22 avril 1926 (1er Ordibehecht 1305). et ont à cet effet désigné pour Leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

SA MAJESTÉ IMPÉRIALE LE SCHAH DE PERSE

Son Altesse Mirza Mohamed Ali Khan Foroughi, Ministre des Aff. Etrangères;

LE PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE TURQUE:

Son Excellence le Docteur Tevfik Rustu Bey, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Député d'Izmir;

LESQUELS, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs reconnus en bonne et due forme sont convenus des dispositions suivantes:

Article 1er. En cas d'une action militaire dirigée contre l'une des Hautes Parties Contractantes par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces, l'autre Partie Contractante s'engage à observer la neutralité vis-à-vis de la première.

Art. 2. Chacune des deux Parties Contractantes s'engage à ne se livrer à aucune agression vis-à-vis de l'autre militaires contre l'une des Hautes Parties Contractantes. violeraient la neutralité de l'autre Partie en vue d'utiliser son territoire pour des passages de troupes, armes, munitions de guerre ou pour des fournitures de vivres, bestiaux et n'importe quelles choses susceptibles de servir à la guerre ou enfin pour le passage des troupes battant en retraite; ou en vue d'exciter et de soulever les populations du territoire neutre dans le but de les employer à leurs fins, ou bien d'opérer des reconnaissances militaires sur ledit territoire, cette Partie devra s'opposer par les armes à ces actions pour sauvegarder sa neutralité.

Art. 4. Au cas où l'une des deux Parties Contractantes serait l'objet d'une action d'hostilité de la part d'une ou de plusieurs tierces Puissances, l'autre Partie Contractante déploiera tous ses efforts pour remédier à la situation. Si, malgré ces efforts, la guerre devenait un fait accompli, les deux Hautes Parties Contractantes s'engagent à examiner de nouveau la situation soigneusement et dans un esprit de bienveillance dans le but de parvenir à trouver une solution conforme à leurs intérêts supérieurs.

Art. 5. Les deux Parties Contractantes s'engagent à ne point admettre sur leur territoire la formation ou le séjour d'organisations ou de groupe- collaboration ainsi que la question ou libre transit à travers les territoires des deux Parties et celle de l'établissement des moyens de communication toute sorte entre les deux Pays seront étudiés soigneusement par les délégués spécialistes compétents qui seront désignés de la part des deux Hautes Parties Contractantes.

Art. 7. Il est entendu qu'en dehors des engagements mutuels pris dans le présent Traité, chacune des Hautes Parties Contractantes conserve son entière liberté d'action en ce qui concerne ses relations avec de tierces Puissances.

Art. 8. Le Présent Traité sera ratifié et les ratifications en seront échangées le plus tôt possible à Téhéran.

Il entrera en vigueur immédiatement après l'échange des ratifications et aura la durée de cinq années. Si le Traité n'est pas dénoncé par l'une ou l'autre des Hautes Parties Contractantes six mois avant l'expiration de ladite période de cinq années, il sera considéré comme ayant automatiquement sa durée de validité une année en plus, la dénonciation ne pouvant toujours produire ses effets qu'après l'expiration d'un délai de six mois.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent Traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

FAIT à ANKARA en double exemplaire le cinq novembre mil neuf cent trente-deux.

(S) **Dr. T. Rustu**
(S) **M. A. Foroughi**

Traité d'Amitié
ENTRE
La Perse et la Turquie

SA MAJESTÉ IMPÉRIALE LE SCHAH DE PERSE:

Son Altesse Mirza Mohamad Ali Khan Foroughi, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères,

LE PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE TURQUE:

Son Excellence le Docteur Tevfic Rustu Bey, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Député d'Izmir,

LESQUELS, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs, reconnus en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes:

Art. I. Il y aura paix inviolable et amitié sincère et perpétuelle entre l'Empire de Perse et la République Turque ainsi qu'entre les ressortissants des deux pays.

Art. II. Les Hautes Parties Contractantes conviennent que les représentants diplomatiques et consulaires de chacune d'Elles continueront à recevoir sur le territoire de l'autre, à charge de réciprocité, le traitement consacré par les principes et la pratique du droit commun international, traitement qui, en tout cas et également sous conditions de réciprocité, ne pourra être moins favorable que le traitement accordé aux représentants diplomatiques et consulaires de la nation la plus favorisée.

Art. III. Les Hautes Parties Contractantes sont d'accord pour régler les relations consulaires, commerciales, douanières et de navigation entre leurs pays ainsi que les conditions de la résidence et du séjour des ressortissants de chacune d'Elles sur le territoire de l'autre, par des conventions conformes aux principes et à la pratique du droit commun international et sur la base d'une parfaite réciprocité

RÉPUBLIQUE TURQUE:

Son Excellence le Docteur Tevfik Rustu Bey, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, Député d'Izmir;

LESQUELS, après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs reconnus en bonne et due forme sont convenus des dispositions suivantes:

Article 1er. En cas d'une action militaire dirigée contre l'une des Hautes Parties Contractantes par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces, l'autre Partie Contractante s'engage à observer la neutralité vis-à-vis de la première.

Art. 2. Chacune des deux Parties Contractantes s'engage à ne se livrer à aucune agression vis-à-vis de l'autre ni à ne faire partie d'aucune alliance ou entente politique, économique ou financière conclue par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces et dirigée contre l'autre Partie ou contre la sécurité militaire et navale de son Pays.

Chacune des deux Parties Contractantes s'engage en outre à ne pas participer à n'importe quelle action hostile dirigée par une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces contre l'autre Partie.

Art. 3. Au cas où une ou plusieurs Puissances tierces procédant aux actes d'hostilité et aux opérations [illegible] à ces actions pour sauvegarder sa neutralité.

Art. 4. Au cas où l'une des deux Parties Contractantes serait l'objet d'une action d'hostilité de la part d'une ou de plusieurs tierces Puissances, l'autre Partie Contractante déploiera tous ses efforts pour remédier à la situation. Si, malgré ces efforts, la guerre devenait un fait accompli, les deux Hautes Parties Contractantes s'engagent à examiner de nouveau la situation soigneusement et dans un esprit de bienveillance dans le but de parvenir à trouver une solution conforme à leurs intérêts supérieurs.

Art. 5. Les deux Parties Contractantes s'engagent à ne point admettre sur leur territoire la formation ou le séjour d'organisations ou de groupements ayant pour but de troubler la paix et la sécurité de l'autre pays ou de changer son Gouvernement ainsi que le séjour de personnes ou de groupements projetant de lutter par propagande ou par tout autre moyen contre l'autre Pays.

Art. 6. Les deux Hautes Parties Contractantes sont d'accord pour régler dans le plus bref délai possible les conditions de leur étroite collaboration dans le domaine économique. Il reste entendu que le choix et le règlement des moyens de la réalisation de cette ou l'autre des Hautes Parties Contractantes six mois avant l'expiration de ladite période de cinq années, il sera considéré comme ayant automatiquement sa durée de validité une année en plus, la dénonciation ne pouvant toujours produire ses effets qu'après l'expiration d'un délai de six mois.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent Traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

FAIT à ANKARA en double exemplaire le cinq novembre mil neuf cent trente-deux.

(S) **Dr. T. Rustu**
(S) **M. A. Foroughi**

Traité d'Amitié

ENTRE

La Perse et la Turquie

L'EMPIRE DE PERSE

et

LA RÉPUBLIQUE TURQUE

Également animés du désir de resserrer les liens d'amitié et de fraternité heureusement existant entre eux,

Ayant convenu de rétablir, dans un nouveau Traité d'Amitié, les dispositions des articles de leur Traité d'Amitié et de Sécurité du 22 Avril 1926, concernant les relations générales des deux Pays, ont, à cette fin, désigné pour leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

charge de réciprocité, le traitement consacré par les principes et la pratique du droit commun international, traitement qui, en tout cas et également sous conditions de réciprocité, ne pourra être moins favorable que le traitement accordé aux représentants diplomatiques et consulaires de la nation la plus favorisée.

Art. III. Les Hautes Parties Contractantes sont d'accord pour régler les relations consulaires, commerciales, douanières et de navigation entre leurs pays ainsi que les conditions de la résidence et du séjour des ressortissants de chacune d'Elles sur le territoire de l'autre, par des conventions conformes aux principes et à la pratique du droit commun international et sur la base d'une parfaite réciprocité

Art. 4. Le présent Traité sera ratifié et l'échange des instruments de ratification aura lieu à Téhéran le plus tôt que faire se pourra. Il entrera en vigueur avec l'échange des ratifications.

EN FOI DE QUOI, les Plénipotentiaires respectifs ont signé le présent Traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

FAIT en double à ANKARA le cinq novembre mil neuf cent trente-deux.

(S): **Dr. T. Rustu**
(S) **M. A. Foroughi**

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

767.9111/22

SEE 867.044/165 FOR #333

FROM Turkey (Sherrill) DATED Jan.23, 1933

TO NAME

1—1127 GPO

REGARDING: Turco-Persian Treaty of Conciliation, Judicial Settlement and Arbitration.

Copy of LA LEGISLATION TURQUE containing notice of ratification of -.

W1

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Teheran, June 29, 1934.

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1934 JUL 24 PM 1 40

No. 129.

Subject: Middle Eastern Pact.

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

EASTERN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
AUG 6 - 1934
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AUG 18 1934
EASTERN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

FOR DISTRIBUTION - CHECK
Yes No

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE
AUG 1 - 1934
A-SAC

AUG 2 - 1934

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
JUL 25 1934
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

767.9111

767.9111/23

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to report that considerable speculation and comment has been given rise to locally as a result of the reproduction in the ETTELA'AT of June 20, 1934, of a Reuter's message from Ankara reporting that the Shah's visit to Turkey has been taken advantage of to undertake negotiations for the conclusion of a mutual pact of guarantee between Turkey and Persia, as well as the possible extension of such an agreement into a multipartite agreement to include, as well, Afghanistan and Iraq.

The Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs has professed to my German colleague to have no knowledge of any such agreement

FILED
AUG 10 1934

agreement and has stated that the Shah's return must be awaited before news may be had of the political results of his visit. However, the Chief of the Oriental Section of the Ministry, Mr. Sineky, of wide experience in the Near East, has informed the Legation, when inquiry was made of him regarding the report, that while he was unable to enter into any details until the Shah's return, he could state that the Shah's visit would prove to have very important results from the point of view of Middle East politics and that it would prove, equally, to possess importance for European diplomacy.

In my recent despatch No. 103 of June 11, 1934, reporting the selection of Turkey to arbitrate the long existing boundary dispute between Persia and Afghanistan I have reviewed at some length the background of the relationships of the Middle Eastern States since the war and the evolution of the foreign policy of those States from a dependence upon Soviet Russia towards an emancipation therefrom. 190R.911/4

As is now to be seen retrospectively, the years 1921 to 1928 represented the high water mark of Soviet influence in The Middle East, the degree of influence, of course, varying in point of time with each country, receding since only 1928 in Afghanistan, earlier in Persia (1925), while Soviet relations with Turkey would appear to have remained consistently stronger than with either of the two other countries mentioned.

In the case of Persia, Soviet aid in the early days after the war was welcomed not by reason of any predeliction for Soviet doctrine but as a counterpoise to British aggression. As the Soviet Union has developed gradually in

strength

761.91

strength and influence and, in these last years, has made its economic power felt with particular force in northern Persia where, before the war, both the political and economic might of Tsarist Russia was exercised without restraint, Persia has felt less and less inclined to lean diplomatically upon Moscow. With the industrialization of Russia, Persia has rightly sensed that the foreign political and economic policies of the Soviet Union were destined to be more and more subordinated to Russian internal development and to be less concerned, as they were in the early days of the Revolution, with specific assistance of "the oppressed peoples of the East" with a view to the embarrassment of Western Imperialism. The self-limiting principles of Stalin's "socialism in one country" have contributed largely to this particular development.

With the increasing preoccupation, accordingly, of Soviet Russia in its internal development, it is natural that the centripetal Middle Eastern tendencies originally set in motion by Soviet Russia should have been taken advantage of by the countries concerned to promote a rapprochement among themselves. A common Moslem religion; in the case of Persia and Afghanistan, a common language; a common culture; and, of major importance, a common struggle towards emancipation, political, material and ideological, serve to promote bonds of common accord between Persia, Afghanistan and Turkey. But, as my Polish colleague, from the benefit of long experience in this country, has observed, these common bonds end at the respective frontiers of the three countries and, since

any

any attempt to pursue common imperialistic aims would only end in revealing the violent contradictions in the external territorial aims of the countries concerned, any mutual pact concluded between them could only serve the cause of peace, an opinion in which I concur.

That the proposed pact is a logical development in the relationships of the States concerned and that it is intended to serve the cause of peace in the Middle East are conclusions which would seem to be generally accepted on the part of my colleagues.

As my Polish colleague, whose opinions are worthy of particular respect, has again observed, while Soviet Russia is apparently and understandingly not disposed to welcome the development of a Middle Eastern accord which might be calculated to interpose difficulties in the way of its relationships with the individual Middle Eastern States in constituting a more effectual barrier to the execution of Soviet policy in the Middle East, to the extent that the accord strengthens the sovereignty of the States concerned and renders them less ready instruments for the execution of the designs of other Powers (Great Britain) against Soviet Russia, the accord would presumably be welcomed by Soviet Russia.

Thus, my Polish colleague has cited the fact that an accord such as that proposed would put an end to the possibility of the incitement of local tribes by foreign Powers interested in engineering friction in the Middle East, such as the Kurdish disturbances on either side of the Turkish and Persian frontiers several years ago and to that extent it would serve the general interests of Soviet Russia and the cause of peace among the States of the Middle East.

While

While there is general scepticism expressed regarding the possible approval of Great Britain to the entrance into a Middle Eastern Pact of Iraq, my British colleague a day or two ago expressed himself rather vaguely on the subject as perceiving no obstacles to the adhesion of Iraq, adding the interesting information that it was his impression that the suggestion had been made that both Great Britain and Soviet Russia should be included in the accord, but that it was not apparent that any useful purpose would be served by Great Britain's adherence.

Neither my Polish colleague nor others with whom I have discussed the pact appear to be informed of the intended or purposed extension of the accord beyond the four Middle Eastern countries, Persia, Afghanistan, Turkey and Iraq, although the former is of the opinion that such an invitation if extended by the original Middle Eastern States would make it difficult for Sir John Simon to explain the disinclination of Great Britain to adhere thereto, adding pertinently, however, that whether or not Soviet Russia and Great Britain adhered to such an accord it would not contrive to compose the differences inherent in the principles represented by the two opposing countries of communism and imperialism.

To quote again my Polish colleague, the minimum objects of Soviet foreign policy in Persia and the Middle East are realized by ensuring the prevention of the use of these Middle Eastern States to serve the interests of Powers hostile to Soviet Russia in the Middle East. Similarly, the minimum objects of British foreign policy in Persia and the Middle East are presumably directed towards the insulation of India from Soviet influence.

A

A Middle Eastern pact, accordingly, would serve the minimum aims of both these Powers.

The inclusion of Iraq in such a pact -- if I may be permitted to suggest an interpretation regarding which my colleague in Baghdad is admittedly more competent to express an opinion than I but which is offered in connection with the general subject of Middle Eastern politics -- would not appear to me to be so contrary to British interests as seems generally to be held by my colleagues as calculated to prevent the adhesion of Iraq. In view of the strong bonds uniting Turkey and Soviet Russia and the unlikelihood that Turkey would permit the pact to be used <u>against</u> the Soviet Union -- an opinion in which my Turkish colleague concurs -- the inclusion of Iraq would seem to offer a means by which Great Britain would be able to ensure itself, short of itself adhering to the pact, that it would not be used <u>against</u> the interests of the British Empire in the Middle East.

To sum up: the proposed pact would appear to be a logical step in the recent developments characterizing the relationships between Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan and, if concluded, would mark a further milestone in the progress of those countries towards political emancipation; it would appear to be in accord with the general foreign policy of Soviet Russia towards the ensuring of peace by regional pacts of mutual guarantee and security; it would appear to serve at least the minimum aims of Soviet policy in the Middle East in precluding the use of Middle Eastern countries to serve the interests of countries hostile to the Soviet Power; and, while, it offers no assurance of

the

the compounding of the inherent contradictions between communism, as represented by the Soviet Union, and imperialism, as represented by the British Empire, it would afford, as my Polish colleague has suggested, a not unimportant psychological addition to the cause of peace.

Respectfully yours,

Wm H Hornibrook

Wm. H. Hornibrook.

Copies to: American Embassy, London.
American Embassy, Istanbul.
American Embassy, Moscow.
American Legation, Baghdad.

File No. 510.

JRC/PE

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 891.9111/369 FOR #307

FROM Persia (Hornibrook) DATED Dec. 28,1934

TO NAME 1—1127 ors

REGARDING: Perso-Turkish treaty of friendship, concluded at Ankara, November 5,1932.
Ratifications of the -- were exchanged on December 22nd, at Teheran.

767.9111/24

lec

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

767.9111/25

SEE 891.9111/384 FOR #516

FROM Iran (Hornibrook) DATED July 24, 1935

TO NAME

1—1127 GPO

REGARDING: Exchange of ratifications of the Irano-Turkish Treaty of Friendship and Security which was signed in 1932, on July 14, 1935.

Wi

B) FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1) Ratifications Exchanged.

767.9111

According to the IRAN of July 16 the ratifications of the Irano-Turkish Treaty of Friendship and Security which was signed in 1932 and recently sanctioned by the Turkish authorities concerned were exchanged at the Foreign Office at 12 o'clock noon, July 14, 1935, between Foreign Minister Furoughi and Ambassador Faik Bey

Bey of Turkey.

Comment: The official text of this treaty was transmitted to the Department as enclosure to this Legation's despatch No. 1304 of December 15, 1932.

In fact two treaties were signed on November 5, 1932, both reestablishing the provisions of the Treaty of Friendship and Security signed on April 22, 1926. One determined the general relations of the two countries, of which ratifications were exchanged on December 23, 1934 (see press despatch No. 307 of December 28, 1934), while the other was concerned with non-aggression, neutrality and economic cooperation. It was this latter treaty that, according to the Turkish Ambassador, was ratified by Turkey by the law of June 15, 1935, and of which the instruments of ratification were exchanged on July 14, 1935, as reported in the foregoing press item.

767.9111/26

TEL. FROM IRAN, NO. 303, SEPT. 28, 1942, 7 PM

Confidential File

Central File: Decimal File 767.9111, Political Relations Of States, Relations; Bi-Lateral Treaties., Political., Turkey And Iran, War. Peace. Friendship. Alliance. Non-Aggression., May 20, 1931 - July 24, 1935. May 20, 1931 - July 24, 1935. MS Turkey, Greece, and the Balkan States: Records of the U.S. Department of State, 1930-1944: Records of the Department of State Relating to Political Relations of Turkey, Greece, and the Balkan States, 1930-1939. National Archives (United States). Archives Unbound, link.gale.com%2Fapps

%2Fdoc%2FSC5111389057%2FGDSC%3Fu%3Domni%26sid%3Dbookmark-GDSC. Accessed 20 June 2025.